Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/225,478	KOHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anne Marie S. Wehbe	1632
All Participants:	Status of Application:	:
(1) Anne Marie S. Wehbe.	(3)	
(2) <u>Raymond Lillie</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 August 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 1-5, 21-22		
Prior art documents discussed: U.S. Patent 5,911,983		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide a variate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representativ	e Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 08/225,478

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant's representative returned the examiner's phone call following a voice message left by the examiner for Raymond Lillie. The examiner explained that although the Board reversed the previous examiner of record's rejection of the claims, new prior art not of record had been identified which would apply to claims 1-3, 5 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The examiner suggested that since claim 4 is considered allowable, the applicant might consider limiting the claims to adenosine deaminase in order to avoid re-opening prosecution. The applicant's representative declined. The examiner indicated that a new office action would be mailed to applicants.